

REMARKS/DISCUSSION OF ISSUES

Applicants have amended claims 1 and 3-5, canceled claim 2 and added new claims 6-7.

Claims 1 and 3-7 are pending in the application.

Applicants thank the Examiner for acknowledging the claim for priority and receipt of certified copies of all the priority documents.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to state whether the drawings are acceptable.

Reexamination and reconsideration of the application are respectfully requested in view of the following remarks

35 U.S.C. § 102 and 103

Claim 1

Claim 1 essentially corresponds to originally-filed claim 2, now rewritten in independent form.

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is patentable over Peterka International Publication WO99/66714 ("Peterka") for at least the following reasons.

Among other things, in the network of claim 1 the filter further evaluates additional data occurring while the user has access to the access control object, monitors a change in the access rights, and triggers withdrawal of the access rights to the access controlled object.

Applicants respectfully submit that Peterka disclose no such features.

The Office Action cites FIG. 3, elements 360-390, but does not cite any text anywhere in Peterka as supposedly disclosing such features.

Applicants respectfully submit that nowhere in FIG. 3 is there any disclosure or mention of evaluating additional data occurring while the user has access to an access control object, monitoring a change in the access rights, and triggering withdrawal of the access rights to the access controlled object. Inspection of FIG. 3 shows the once a function call is made (330), and the condition is met (380), the function is allowed (390) and that is the end of the process. There is nothing in FIG.

3 which discloses that access rights are ever dynamically withdrawn during an access which has already been granted. Meanwhile, Peterka specifically discloses that his invention "evaluates the current conditions . . . before granting permission," (page 33, lines 5-9) but does not state that conditions are further evaluated while access is in progress.

Accordingly, for at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the network of claim 1 is patentable over Peterka.

Claims 3-4

Claims 3-4 depend from claim 1 and are deemed patentable for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1.

Claim 5

Claim 5 essentially has been rewritten in independent form.

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 5 is patentable over Peterka in view of brown et al. U.S. Patent 5,941,947 ("Brown") for at least the following reasons.

Among other things, in the network of claim 5 an access right manager has a data structure in the form of a tree for arranging the access controlled objects, wherein the tree includes a plurality of nodes which each contain a list of permitted users or user groups respectively, of an access controlled object and for each user or user group respectively, include a list of methods of use.

Applicants respectfully submit that neither Peterka nor Brown nor any possible combination thereof includes such features.

The Office Action cites Brown col. 2, lines 38-46 as supposedly disclosing such features.

Applicants respectfully disagree.

The cited text in Brown merely discloses that a directory service maintains a directory of content objects as nodes in a tree-like structure. However, the cited text makes no mention of each node containing a list of permitted users or user groups, respectively, of the access controlled object and for each user or user group respectively, including a list of methods of use. Indeed, Applicants see no such disclosure anywhere in Brown. Instead, it appears that Brown uses an access

control matrix and access rights database (152) which is **organized by users, not by objects**, and which is organized on a user-by-user (or user-group-by-user-group) basis to list for each user (or user group) the content nodes and access operations available to the **user** (see, e.g., col. 16, lines 39-45 and FIG. 6).

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that no combination of Peterka and Brown would ever produce the network of claim 5.

Accordingly, for at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 5 is patentable over Peterka and Brown.

NEW CLAIMS 6-7

Claim 6

Claim 6 depends from claim 5 and is deemed patentable for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 5, and for the following additional reasons.

Among other things, in the network of claim 6, the filter further evaluates additional data occurring while the user has access to the access control object, monitors a change in the access rights, and triggers withdrawal of the access rights to the access controlled object.

As explained above with respect to claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that Peterka discloses no such features.

Accordingly, for at least these additional reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 6 is patentable over the cited prior art.

Claim 7

Among other things, the network of claim 7 includes a software system adapted to reserve use of a first one the access control objects by a user via one of the terminals, wherein the software system further comprises a filter adapted to continuously monitor dynamic data affecting access rights to the first control object and, in response to the dynamic data, to generate a message indicating withdrawal of the access rights of the user to the first access control object, the software system being adapted to release the reservation of the first access control object in response

to the message from the filter.

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited prior art does not disclose any network that continuously monitors dynamic data affecting access rights to an control object, in response to the dynamic data generates a message indicating withdrawal of the access rights of the user to the access control object, and releases the reservation of the first access control object in response to the message.

Accordingly, for at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 7 is patentable over the cited prior art.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing explanations, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and reexamine the present application, allow claims 1 and 3-7 and pass the application to issue. In the event that there are any outstanding matters remaining in the present application, the Examiner is invited to contact Kenneth D. Springer (Reg. No. 39,843) at (703) 715-0870 to discuss these matters.


If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment (except for the issue fee) to Deposit Account No. 50-0238 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17, particularly extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

VOLENTINE FRANCOS & WHITT, P.L.L.C.

Date: 29 December 2004

By:


Kenneth D. Springer
Registration No. 39,843

VOLENTINE FRANCOS & WHITT, P.L.L.C.
One Freedom Square
11951 Freedom Drive, Suite 1260
Reston, Virginia 20190
Telephone No.: (703) 715-0870
Facsimile No.: (703) 715-0877